

**From:** Wilbur Goodwin  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/4/02 11:45pm  
**Subject:** MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

To: The US Department of Justice

I am writing to you today to express my opinions in regard to the Microsoft debate in accordance with US law, i.e., the Tunney Act, which requires a public comment period that expires on January 28, 2002. I fully support Microsoft and am anxious to see this protracted three-year dispute between Microsoft and the US Federal Government resolved once and for all. Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the US Federal Government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the US Court of Appeals ruling. I support the settlement that was reached on November 2, 2001, and sincerely hope that there will be no further action taken against Microsoft at the Federal level.

This settlement is tough, but reasonable, equitable and fair to all parties involved. It has been reached after extensive negotiations, and it allows Microsoft to continue designing and marketing its innovative software, while benefiting the technology industry as a whole. Under this agreement, Microsoft must disclose information about certain internal interfaces in Windows to competing companies. Microsoft has pledged to carry out all provisions of this agreement, and the government has created a technical oversight committee to insure Microsoft compliance. While I personally am strongly opposed to any company being legally forced to disclose its company sensitive or proprietary information, I firmly believe that consumers overwhelmingly agree that this settlement is the best alternative for them, the industry and the American economy, under the circumstances.

Unfortunately, a few "special interests" are attempting to use this review period to derail the proposed settlement and prolong this litigation even in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. In my opinion, If Microsoft's competitors had expended more time, energy and financial resources in acquiring, nurturing and maintaining a strong technical base of innovative skills, and less on litigation, they wouldn't have had to resort to such costly legal tactics in the first place. If they can't compete on their own volition, then maybe they shouldn't be in the business!

In closing, I want to reiterate that I strongly believe that this settlement, as opposed to more needless and costly litigation, is in the best interest of, and will benefit, the consumers, the industry and the American economy. Furthermore, I urge you to get on with the process at hand by upholding this agreement, so that Microsoft can prudently devote its invaluable resources to continued innovation rather than further protracted litigation. I will anxiously await your decision. I have the utmost confidence that you will make the only decision that is in the best interest of everyone concerned.

Sincerely,

Wilbur Goodwin (Retired)  
Columbia, SC